UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2522nd MEETING: 28 MARCH 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2522)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 22 March 1984 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16431)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2522nd MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 28 March 1984, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Javier ARIAS STELLA (Peru).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2522)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 22 March 1984 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16431)

The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 22 March 1984 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16431)

1. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Democratic Yemen, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Natorf (Poland), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The Council is meeting today in response to a request which appears in a letter dated 22 March 1984 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the President of the Security Council.

3. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the text of a letter dated 20 March 1984 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the President of the Security Council [*S/16425*].

4. The first speaker is the Secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mr. Ali Abdusalam Treiki. I welcome him and invite him to make his statement.

5. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Yesterday I had an opportunity to extend to you, Mr. President, congratulations on behalf of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. It gives me pleasure today to state again our satisfaction at the excellent way in which you are conducting the business of the Council.

6. During the past year the Council has met twice to consider acts of provocation and aggression by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. It has also met on several occasions to consider acts of provocation, aggression and even occupation by the United States Administration against the territories of small, non-aligned countries—for example, the constant aggression committed by that Administration against Nicaragua and its invasion and occupation of Grenada.

7. Today we are meeting to consider a dangerous, indeed explosive, situation resulting from United States provocation and harassment of Libya. This could cause a deterioration in the region, threatening international peace and security.

8. As I said yesterday [*2521st meeting*], I wish that the representative of the United States would be kind enough, although she represents a super-Power, to be here to listen to representatives of small Member States. Perhaps her excuse for not being here is that it is difficult for her to hear the truth; the truth is bitter, and it could disturb her. But I am confident that her deputy will convey to her in full the truths that will be spoken here.

9. I do not think I need dwell on the many details which have been laid before the Council concerning the

acts of aggression, provocation and harassment constantly carried out by the United States against the Jamahiriya, its revolution and its leadership. At Council meetings held on 22 and 23 February 1983 [*2415th to 2418th meetings*] and in August of that year [*2464th, 2466th and 2468th meetings*], my delegation spoke of all those acts. In addition, it has addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Council several letters containing complete details of American acts of aggression and provocation.

10. The reasons for the differences which exist between the United States and the Jamahiriya are not new; they date back to the first days of the great September Revolution in Libya. Before the revolution, Libya was among the protectorates of the United States. The United States maintained five military bases on the territory of the Jamahiriya, and monopolistic American corporations exploited the oil of the Jamahiriya, which was being sold at that time for $1.50 a barrel. Libya and the United States bases on its territory were used in 1956 to launch an act of aggression against the Arab nation and to attack Egypt. Those aggressive bases on Libyan territory were used on many occasions to launch acts of aggression against States of the region.

11. In the early days of the revolution, those bases were eliminated; Willis Air Force Base was renamed as the Umm Aitiqah base. The representative of the United States stated that two aircraft were photographed taking off from that base, but she did not mention that Umm Aitiqah, after whom the base is named, was an innocent six-year-old girl who was killed by bombings during training exercises by the United States Air Force near the base. Some may not know that, and I do not think that the representative of the United States was aware of that fact.

12. With the establishment of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, there began an economic blockade and a campaign of military harassment. United States Air Force violations of Libyan airspace over the past years number more than 336; there have been acts of provocation by the United States Navy, the most recent among them being the dispatch of an aircraft-carrier to our territorial waters; our planes have been attacked, and two Libyan jets have been downed, as members are fully aware. Additionally, the United States seeks to turn other countries—including some sister States—against the Jamahiriya, initiating a hostile political campaign and attempting to drive a wedge between Arab States, and a cultural blockade was initiated. This reached such heights that for the first time in the history of the United States a law was enacted forbidding Libyan students to study certain subjects, such as nuclear engineering and aeronautics. To all this must be added the ongoing vicious media campaign and the harassment of Libyan students.

13. Yesterday, the representative of the United States referred to an incident in which a Libyan student in her country was beaten and wounded by an agent of the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA); during the trial,—which was widely covered by the media—the CIA agent testified that he had shot the student as a warning against continuing his support for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), but that student had assaulted him. Those are the facts of the incident the representative mentioned, as published in American newspapers.

14. Why are all these hostile acts being carried out against Libya? It is because of Libya's position on the Palestinian question. When, under the Carter Administration, I met with the United States Secretary of State, he told me that there was no problem between us apart from Libya's stand on the Palestinian question, because Libya, he said, was supporting terrorism. I replied, "Let us first define terrorism." We make distinctions: we are against terrorism as such, but we cannot accept the label of terrorist to be applied to Palestinians who are defending their right to liberate their own land, or to the revolutionaries of South Africa or of the South West Africa People's Organization. But, as I said yesterday, this is American logic: the Palestinians are terrorists, but the rebels in Nicaragua are freedom fighters.

15. The United States Under-Secretary of State for African Affairs says that Libya is behind the failure of all his Government's attempts to establish peace in the Arab world. This, then, is the cause for his country's campaign of hostility, provocation and harassment against Libya. But American policy in the Arab region—based on support for the Zionist entity and for occupation—has been denounced not by Colonel Qaddafi or Hafez Al-Assad, but by King Hussein. I do not think it is possible to say about King Hussein what is being said about Muammar Qaddafi and Hafez Al-Assad. King Hussein has said that the United States policy is biased. It is the policy of Israel, for there is no difference between Israel and the United States.

16. They tell us, "You Libyans are requested to accept Israeli occupation and the elimination of the PLO and the Palestinian people, or else you must be destroyed and driven out and the Libyan Revolution must be attacked." They are against Libyan policy because, they say, Libya practices terrorism. But what terrorism is that? I referred yesterday to American terrorism: the Shah of Iran was a friend and ally of the United States and was protected by the United States even though he killed thousands of innocent people and displaced thousands of families. The same was true of Somoza: he was no terrorist—he was a friend of the United States. It was true of Batista in Cuba, and so on, through the whole chain of agents and terrorists shedding the blood of peoples.

17. The hostile United States policy against Libya was most recently manifested in the dispatch of AWACS aircraft to the region in an act of provocation against my country. Why were those AWACS planes

sent to the region? Because, they said, there was a Libyan threat against the Sudan—this is a repetition of what took place last year at the request of two Arab States. Libya's population is 3 million; the total population of Egypt and Sudan amounts to 70 million. I wish to assure the representative of the United States that he will be disappointed if he thinks that there is going to be a war between Arab States; Libya, Egypt and the Sudan are at war against American imperialism, which is hostile to Arabs and allied with Israel.

18. The underlying problem is that the policy of the United States is under the full control of zionism, which uses that policy to serve its own interests and seeks to destroy the Arab region. This not only inflicts troubles upon the United States, but it also undermines that country's interests. In the current American presidential campaign we see a graphic example: the candidates seem to be campaigning in Israel rather than in the United States. Hart, Mondale, Reagan—they are all scrambling to approve the move of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem. Last year *The Christian Science Monitor* reported that Begin was more powerful in Congress than the President of the United States himself. That is a fact. That President, leader of the strongest country in the world, met with a number of members of the Zionist lobby to ascertain their point of view on providing Jordan with weapons. He had decided to give weapons to Jordan, but then reversed that decision when it became clear that King Hussein ultimately is an Arab who will not sacrifice the interests of the Arab nation.

19. There is no problem between Libya and the United States as such; it is a problem between the Arab nation and the United States. Senator Jackson has said that the only friend of the United States in the region is Israel and has described the Arab States that label themselves moderates and friends of the United States as agents. That is the truth.

20. The policy of the United States in the region encourages aggression. Is the United States interested in protecting Egypt and the Sudan? Since when? As I mentioned yesterday, was not Egypt attacked and destroyed by American weapons? Did not the United States try to use force against Abdel Nasser and to inflict problems on him, including a CIA attempt to assassinate him? Since when have the Americans been so interested in protecting the sisterly Sudan? They only want the Sudan to be antagonistic to Arab nationalism, the Arab nation and Libya.

21. We, the small peoples, who are destined to face aggression and not to have the right to choose our policies, are either to be agents or to be attacked and destroyed or subject to acts of provocation. The record of American aggression against small peoples is very well known to all representatives present. It ranges from acts of subversion to direct attack, as is happening in Nicaragua, or occupation, as was the case with Grenada. I recall some of the operations carried out by the CIA and the American Administration in various parts of the world, as well as the history of American Administrations in Latin America since the Monroe Doctrine. That history is one of occupation and starvation. As I said last year when I visited Nicaragua, I was shocked to see that Nicaragua was more underdeveloped than many countries in our region. But the most important thing for the United States was to keep Somoza in power—Somoza, who killed his people, as did Batista in Cuba.

22. I also recall the occupation of the Panama Canal, the changing of régimes, the occupation of the Dominican Republic and other acts of aggression against nearly all the States of Latin America. I do not want to go back into the history of what happened in Panama in 1909 and 1920 concerning the Government of General Jacobo; in Guatemala in 1958 and 1964; or of what happened in Chile, culminating in the assassination of President Allende in 1973. In 1961, the CIA planned a military *coup* in El Salvador and launched an act of aggression against Cuba. It has carried out acts of subversion in Brazil. In 1964, the American forces stationed in Panama launched an attack against a mass demonstration there. In 1950, the American armed forces landed in the Dominican Republic. From 1979 up to the present day, the United States has been trying with all the means at its disposal to overthrow the progressive régime in Nicaragua. I have also mentioned what happened in Grenada in 1983.

23. There is a similar pattern in Africa. In 1961, Lumumba was killed in the Congo by United States agents. In 1966, the Americans planned the *coup* which overthrew President Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana. The United States is financing UNITA [*União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola*] bands led by Savimbi, who is still launching his attacks against Angola with the help of the American Administration. The United States, which is keen to reach a solution to the problems of southern Africa, is the main financer of the UNITA bands. Moreover, it provides the rebel Hissein Habré in Chad with all sorts of weapons to kill his own people.

24. All this is in addition to what happened in Iran —the overthrow of the Government of Mossadegh because he nationalized the oil—and the continuous provocation against the leadership of various countries today.

25. Finally, there are the attempts at assassination and physical liquidation. We have finally heard that President Reagan has allocated $20 million for the assassination of Colonel Qaddafi and Khomeini. These are the humanitarian acts of the United States, whose policy has come under the control of the Zionist policy in our region!

26. There is continuous aggression against my country, provocative acts against the Jamahiriya and other small peoples—Grenada, Angola, Mozambique, Viet

Nam, Afghanistan and Poland. No small country in any part of the world is safe from its share of direct American aggression.

27. The policy of the present United States Administration, which is based on confrontation, aggression and the deployment of missiles, may lead the world to war. In the past few years the world has gone through no worse period than the present, because the current United States Administration has no consideration for morals or international norms. If we look at the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, we find that the current United States Administration's record is replete with support for aggression. United Nations resolutions of the past year alone make clear the extent of this policy and how dangerous it is. It is a policy of provocative acts against small States whose only sin is that they do not give in to American dictates and do not accept American intervention.

28. As a small people, what interest do we have in having abnormal relations with the United States? We want dialogue. We, the small, non-aligned States, want to establish balanced relations on the basis of mutual interest. We do not accept being agents. We do not accept being Somozas or Batistas or Shahs of Iran. The Jamahiriya sacrificed more than half its population in a long war against the Fascists. We would not agree to be agents; we would not agree to have American military bases, or any foreign bases for that matter.

29. I realize that the Security Council—despite its full conviction of the gravity of this aggressive policy followed by the United States Administration—will remain paralysed because that Administration has the power to veto any Council resolution, as it did last year in the case of Grenada and on other occasions. But we are confident that the misled American people —whose money is being spent in the service of aggression, whose money is being spent to serve the Zionist entity, at a time when unemployment is soaring and it is looking for a way to make ends meet—can and should play a major role in deterring the United States Administration.

30. The continued hostile American policy against the Arab nation and against the Jamahiriya will not lead to any change in policy on the part of the Arab nation. The Arab nation cannot accept occupation or the Zionists; it cannot accept aggression. Indeed, that policy will be to the detriment of United States interests in that and other regions.

31. From time to time a voice of reason is heard in the United States. I shall now refer to some remarks made last year by Senator Dodd in reply to President Reagan during a joint meeting of Congress to discuss President Reagan's policy in Central America. He said:

> "We cannot bear the consequences of adopting such an important policy on the basis of ignorance. The fact is that now, in 1983, some senior officials seem to know very little about that region, just as we knew very little about Indo-China in 1963. The peoples of Central America live in abject poverty. They cannot feed themselves when they are hungry; they cannot find a doctor when they are sick. They live in shanty-towns without any services, without fresh water. The majority of them are illiterate. The five Spanish-speaking States of that region need a whole year to produce what our nation produces in less than three days. If Central America had not been so poor, there would have been no revolution."

He said also:

> "This is the formula for failure. We always choose the loser. The American people know we have taken this path before. It leads to nothing but an endless series of interventions."

He went on:

> "The Administration spends a billion dollars to confront the revolutionary army of no more than 7,000 men in El Salvador. That means that almost $140,000 is being allocated for each revolutionary. This is a losing policy, the policy of aggression against starving peoples."

That is the policy of the American Administration.

32. Shamelessly, the United States admits it has sent AWACS aircraft to spy on Libya. Mr. Shultz himself has admitted that. Yesterday the representative of the United States boasted that her Government has photographs; that is an admission of spying and the use of reconnaissance. That Government threatens that any Libyan attempt to attack those hostile aircraft will lead to grave consequences. As I said yesterday, we are supposed to welcome the jets that are there to carry out acts of aggression, and to host them, because, of course, they are American and display the American flag.

33. In conclusion, I would observe that the Council must shoulder its special responsibility. It is entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, and it cannot let one of its permanent members pursue such a policy of aggression against whole peoples, a policy of occupation of the territories of small countries. If that law of the jungle is allowed to continue, a very dangerous precedent will be established, and it will lead to nothing but war and destruction. It is high time that the United States was told that it is not the policeman of the world; it is not entitled to carry out these acts of aggression; it is not responsible for the world. The United States must be told to put an end to its acts of aggression. It is in the interest of the American people itself that it do so: indeed, the expansionist and aggressive policies of Hitler led Germany to destruction. Throughout history the policy of arrogance, gunboat diplomacy and military might has resulted in nothing but catastrophe. In the end, the American peo-

ple will itself fall victim to such an aggressive policy against all freedom- and peace-loving forces.

34. In conclusion, I would remind the Council of the advice given by an American journalist I mentioned yesterday. He himself was a victim of racial discrimination. In an essay in *The Toronto Sun*, he writes:

> "Perhaps the time has come for the Western leaders to finally decide which nations are truly worth supporting, and which must be left to their own fate. As Frederick the Great said, 'He who would defend everything defends nothing.' "*

35. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): The United States desires to make only three simple points.

36. AWACS aircraft are not aggressive weapons. They are not instruments of violence. They are, however, effective observers. The aircraft were dispatched at the request of the Government of the Sudan after it had been attacked by Libya under circumstances that have been reviewed in detail in the Council.

37. The United States understands full well why the Government of Libya prefers that no one observe its attacks on its neighbours: such deeds are best done in stealth, covered with denials.

38. United States actions are wholly consistent with international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Libya's neighbours have the right to defend themselves; their friends have the right to help them, as long as their actions are consistent with the Charter and international law. United States actions are consistent with the Charter and with the law.

39. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

40. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: I should like at the outset to extend sincere condolences to the Government and people of Guinea on the death of President Ahmed Sékou Touré. With his death the third world has suffered a great, irreparable loss. The Government and people of the Syrian Arab Republic have the greatest admiration and appreciation for the tremendous victories of President Ahmed Sékou Touré in his continuous struggle to liberate Africa and liquidate colonialism. President Sékou Touré was one of the first leaders to realize the dangers of Zionist schemes to the peace and safety of the Middle East region. We shall never forget his valiant stand in refusing to acquiesce in plans to prolong colonialism. Thus, he and his people, owing to their attachment to principles, have faced many problems. But, thanks to his courage, he was able to break out of the isolation which colonialism attempted to impose on him.

41. President Ahmed Sékou Touré's death is a loss inflicted on the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in the establishment, development and support of which the late President played a fundamental role. It is also a loss to the Organization of African Unity, for the establishment of which the late President struggled. Similarly, we shall not forget his great contribution to the establishment of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

42. We seize this opportunity to convey, through you, Mr. President, our heartfelt condolences to the people and Government of Guinea and his bereaved family. May his soul rest in peace.

43. Before beginning my statement, Sir, allow me to express our great satisfaction at your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that by the end of your term you will have enriched the Council with your wisdom, your tact, your outstanding diplomacy and your deep understanding of the problems of the international community, especially those of the developing countries.

44. I should like also to express to your predecessor, Mr. Shah Nawaz, representative of Pakistan, our great appreciation and gratitude for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the Council's work during a period fraught with grave events. Thanks to his deep understanding of the reasons behind international crises afflicting our world, he managed to conduct the Council's work in an objective manner and with ideal wisdom. He has our full respect and appreciation.

45. We participate in this debate, on the one hand, to express our grave concern at the threats to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya represented in suspect United States military movements and provocations designed to create a climate conducive to aggression against this sister State—aggression which is but one more link in the chain of acts of aggression launched globally by the United States against the States and peoples of Asia, Africa and Central America.

46. On the other hand, we participate in this discussion to appeal to the Council to live up to its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations and put an end to a United States policy pursued with the force of arms or the threat of force on the pretext of protecting American interests. It is as though our globe were created to serve American interests and as though there were no legitimate national interests on the face of the earth save those in the service of the United States or those that acquiesce in American hegemony and exploitation.

47. Although we know in advance that the Council will not arrive at a decision leading to the containment and deterrence of American superiority and the arro-

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

gance of imperialism based on military might and wide-scale proliferation in large parts of the world, we are confident that these discussions are useful because they promote an understanding of the greatest problem that has emerged since the Second World War, that is, the denial by the United States of the principle of the supremacy of law in international relations and the adoption of force globally as an instrument of United States foreign policy.

48. We do not exaggerate when we say that, although today's world is on the threshold of the twenty-first century, thanks to the technological revolution, regrettably, in the field of international relations it is witnessing a return to the nineteenth century, which was the apogee of the policy of force to dominate peoples and their destinies.

49. The attempts of foreign hegemony faced by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya must be discussed in the context of the comprehensive policy of the United States aimed at subjugating the forces that believe in freedom and sovereignty and strive to consolidate their subjective identity and achieve their social and economic development in solidarity with the forces of liberation in the world.

50. Proceeding from our belief in the justice of the struggle of those peoples yearning to rid themselves of the yoke of foreign domination and hegemony, we consider that the United States, despite its colossal conventional and nuclear military arsenal and its tremendous material and agricultural capabilities, will fail in its attempt to create a world devoted to the service of American imperialist interests, which are in basic contradiction to the interests of the peoples. The third world, despite its problems and scourges inherited from colonialist exploitation and the austerity and stinginess it faces on the part of those States that could help it establish a new, all-round more equitable international order, is capable, thanks to its enlightenment, solidarity, varied relations of co-operation, indigenous capabilities and self-reliance, of resisting the all-pervading American blackmail that extends even to food supply and education. There are States that have put up a heroic resistance—and are still doing so—to avoid falling into the sphere of American hegemony. There is no doubt that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is one of those States. Hence it is the target of an all-out American onslaught, in contravention of the Charter and United Nations resolutions and of the most rudimentary principles of international conduct. Moreover, the overt and covert acts of aggression against Nicaragua are further proof of United States resolve to threaten every State whose policy is not in line with its ambitions and self-interests and departs from the sphere of American hegemony.

51. The threat to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is not new, but is an escalation of provocations which began in 1969 out of opposition to the principles of the 1 September Revolution and which have widened in scope, becoming more vicious and dangerous since 1980, especially since the coming into office of the Reagan Administration, which believes in the use of force as an absolute value in its international relations. It is worth recalling that the recent threats to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the bolstering of the Rapid Deployment Forces in the area have come this time in the wake of the failure of the Israeli-American alliance to impose the agreement of 17 May 1983 on our sister country of Lebanon.

52. Washington, after its dishonourable victory against tiny Grenada, resorted to an intensification of tension in Central America, southern Africa, the Gulf, the Middle East and especially against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. It thus once again dispatched its AWACS aircraft.

53. We are told that the AWACS aircraft are a means of defence. All the weapons provided to Israel by the United States have been provided as defensive weapons. Have we forgotten that defensive weapons are also offensive weapons? Is there a distinction? Are the AWACS aircraft not a means of espionage? Is espionage not a prelude to aggression? Therefore the American pretext that espionage is legitimate because the AWACS aircraft are non-offensive does not accord with the principles of international law. I am afraid the representative of the United States will need some help in selling that message to those present in this chamber.

54. Espionage is part and parcel of a military operation. The United States redispatched the AWACS aircraft for the purpose of provocation and sent warplanes and missiles to create a new hotbed of tension. It justified all these acts before the American people by stating that they were for the protection of threatened American interests and American allies. But no one believed these allegations, not even the American press itself—known for its general hostility to Arabs and for its bias in favour of zionism—which uncovered the real reasons for the American action. Suffice it to recall the press reports referred to in yesterday morning's meeting [*2520th meeting*] which reveal the real nature of the crisis in the region and the need to place the blame on others, in this case on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in particular—this despite the general conviction of the Council that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, because of its principled support for progressive forces and Governments and its defiance of imperialism, is the target if not the victim.

55. Suffice it to recall also the American aggression in August 1981, when the United States Navy carried out aggressive manoeuvres from 17 to 22 August in the Gulf of Sidra, inside the territorial waters of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in an area which the United States, the owner of the AWACS aircraft, knew full well to be an area set aside for Libyan Air Force training. Eight American planes of the United States Sixth Fleet attacked and shot down two Libyan planes. That act of aggression gave rise to deep apprehension in the

Arab and the non-aligned countries. The Group of Arab States at the United Nations addressed a declaration on 21 August 1981 to the President of the Council [*S/14638/Rev.1, annex*] which contained a strong condemnation of American threats and provocations against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in its meeting on 28 August 1981, issued a communiqué condemning the American aggression. I shall not read out the text in view of the lateness of the hour.

56. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries persisted, at the ministerial and other levels, in warning about the threats inherent in the repeated United States acts of provocation against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. But these acts of provocation did not cease; nor did the vicious media campaign cease against the régime and President of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; in fact, it intensified.

57. The Security Council was convened in February 1983 and on other occasions. However, the more the United States and others escalate their attacks on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the greater is the international support afforded to the Government and people of the Jamahiriya. For everyone knows that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is a State of confrontation and steadfastness, that it is a State of principles and not anyone's broker or lackey, that it is a State that has devoted its capabilities to defending rights and has remained steadfast, despite the small size of its human resources.

58. If the aim of the statement by Mr. Shultz, United States Secretary of State, on 20 March 1984—the statement in which he accused the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya of having committed aggression, but did not furnish any proof of that—was to make political mileage with the Zionist lobby, to serve the interests of his President, that is no concern of ours. Indeed, the United States President and his two rivals are allies of Israel and have declared their allegiance to and their alliance with Israel. All of them feel that this settler colonialism in occupied Palestine is legitimate and is no impediment to peace. The electoral campaign in the United States is boiling down to a rivalry over which of the candidates will be the first to transfer the United States Embassy from Tel Aviv to occupied Jerusalem. If, however, the aim of Mr. Shultz was to precipitate a war among Arabs, to deplete Arab capabilities and divert them from the aim of liberation from the Zionist-Israeli aggression and of breaking the chains of Camp David, he will not succeed, for the Arab people will stand up to these attempts.

59. We did not participate in the discussions yesterday, for well-known reasons. We took no account of the letter contained in document S/16420, because it does not include elements which would enable the members of the Council and others to reach the proper conclusion about the truth of what is happening in the region and because of our firm conviction that these matters could and should have been discussed amicably, among the parties concerned, in the League of Arab States or the Organization of African Unity.

60. But the Libyan complaint before the Council today is a different matter, because it involves a violation of Libyan sovereignty by a State that is a permanent member of the Council, a State which threatens and violates the sovereignty and interferes in the internal affairs of other States. The information provided by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya merits all our concern. The United States actions constitute provocation and are hostile in their nature and their aims.

61. Moreover, this information has been confirmed by statements by United States officials, led by Mr. Shultz. He confirmed the presence of the AWACS aircraft, as was done also by Mr. Romberg, a spokesman for the State Department, when he said, according to *The New York Times* of 20 March:

> "AWACS will be part of combined air defense operations being carried out by Egypt and the Sudan".*

According to the same article, another official of the United States Administration stated:

> "Our planes are there and don't mess with them.
>
> "We told the Libyans that we are deploying our own military aircraft in the region and any action against them could have serious consequences".*

62. Does that not constitute a grave threat directed against a Member State? We have also noted that, in the statement that I have just quoted by an official spokesman of the United States Administration, the word "region" is used. We conclude that the theatre of operation of the AWACS aircraft includes the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

63. In addition to the provocations included in the statement to which I have just referred, there was mention of certain internal situations, which are no concern of ours. Furthermore, the spokesman's words "there is no evidence of preparations for a massive attack"* constituted an acknowledgement that the alleged Libyan threat of an invasion has no basis in fact.

64. There is every indication that the United States is seeking to consolidate its aggressive military presence in the region. All these pretexts are simply being used to deceive both national and international public opinion. Washington is seeking to create a hotbed of tension, and the victims will be the Arabs. What other aim could the barrage of these haphazard accusations have?

65. The truth is that the United States military aid and the provision of United States weapons of all kinds

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

are designed simply to cause Arab bloodshed and to fan the flames of Arab differences. They are not designed to restore Arab rights. The only aim of the weapons, including AWACS aircraft and other *matériel*, supplied by the United States is to create tension among the Arabs. This is indicated in the letter from Mr. Ali Treiki, the Secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The letter indicates also that the United States Administration is trying to deepen the schism in the Arab homeland and to play the Arabs off against each other.

66. The basic idea behind the establishment of the Rapid Deployment Forces and the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel is aggression against the Arabs, the consolidation of the Israeli occupation and the fulfilment of Zionist claims over the region. The idea is certainly not to help the Arabs.

67. The Council must understand the dimensions of the scheme now being implemented. It must realize that the aggression launched by the United States Administration against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and against the peoples of the region is a grave threat to international peace and security by a State member of the Council. These acts of aggression by a super-Power, which is supposed to be a responsible and prudent State, are flagrant violations of the Charter and the principles of international law. We know, of course, that the United states will, as in the past, prevent the Council from shouldering its basic responsibilities, despite the grave threat to the peace and security of the region. Nevertheless, we call upon the States members of the Council that cherish peace to do their utmost to put an end to the United States military presence in all parts of the Arab region. The Arabs do not need the might of the United States—actually, the might of the United States is the might of Israel.

68. The only threat hovering over us is the Zionist threat. If Arabs are temporarily divided, this is only because of the policy of the United States, which does not understand that the nations and peoples of the region reject alliances and foreign intervention, and that they are committed to the liberation of the occupied Arab, Lebanese and Palestinian territories. Friendship with the Arabs cannot be built on the ruins of the Arabs. If the United States wants to deal honestly with the Arab nation it must respect Arab national interests and must establish relations based on mutual respect.

69. The United States has shown—and continues to show in its strategic policies and daily practices—that it is interested only in tearing apart the Arab nation, exploiting its wealth, and consolidating Israeli occupation by any means, including the unlimited assistance provided to Israel, which occupies Palestine and portions of Lebanon and Syria. The United States is ignoring the political reality that the Arabs will never, under any circumstances, permit their lands to become a base or a way station for American interests or for American policies aimed at achieving hegemony over the world.

70. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Permit me first, Sir, to congratulate you briefly, not only on your assumption of the presidency for this month, but also on the magnificent way in which you have already handled your delicate office, in continuation of the excellent example set by your immediate predecessor, Ambassador Shah Nawaz of Pakistan. The brevity of this compliment is, once again, dictated by the exigencies of time and is in inverse proportion to the warmth and sincerity behind it as well as to the outstanding merit to which, I shall be the first to acknowledge, it pays only a poor tribute.

71. Permit me also to join you and the other speakers who have lamented the untimely passing away of the late President Sékou Touré of Guinea. We had the privilege of welcoming him in Malta not so very long ago. We were impressed by his personality and the breadth of his vision as much as we admire the sterling contribution he rendered to his country and to his young continent. We convey our sad condolences to his family, to his people, to his country and to Africa.

72. If I might take a bit farther the analogy of ideas associated with the letter P, introduced by our British colleague yesterday, I might be allowed to add that the letter P is also associated with prudence, with patience and with perseverance in the pursuit of peace. These, it may be recalled, are attributes which all members of the Council should share, perhaps now as never before, given the present acute state of tension throughout the world.

73. Perhaps we also need to be reminded—all of us, big and small alike—that, irrespective of our ideological orientation or geographical location, we have to abide strictly and fully by the obligations we freely assumed when we joined the United Nations and the respective regional organizations to which we may belong.

74. We might perhaps also be permitted to stress that internationally recognized principles have specific content and lay down binding norms of inter-State behaviour. Those principles, therefore, are not merely source material from which we embellish our statements; they are not academic shrines before which we make ritualistic and absent-minded genuflections. Rather, the carefully defined words of each relevant principle constitute accurate descriptions of actual international behaviour expected from and incumbent upon each one of us.

75. Today, more than ever before, it has become evident that, for better or for worse, in international relations for every action there is an opposite but unequal reaction. It is also evident that with areas of overlapping tension all too widespread on the political map any negative action carries with it the certainty of setting off a chain-reaction, which has far-reaching consequences affecting the interests of entire regions.

76. We have also seen that the cumulative effects of such negative actions over the years have not—I repeat, not—rendered any significant advantage to any one side at the expense of the other. This applies not only to the States concerned, but also to their neighbours and to the military and ideological division in the world today. On the contrary, negative actions have produced uncounted damage, suffering and death, while leaving permanent scars on the body politic, which have now assumed frightening proportions.

77. In these circumstances, surely the time is overdue to halt these negative processes, to reverse direction and resolutely to embark on positive action. My Government, for one, firmly believes so. We have deliberately shed the military mantle of past centuries of our history, turning our backs away permanently from armed confrontation, and instead firmly pursuing the path of peaceful economic co-operation.

78. So, even as I speak here today, back home in Valletta special envoys from several Mediterranean countries, including all the North African Mediterranean countries, are gathered together jointly searching for new concerted initiatives on which we can peacefully embark, so as eventually to free the Mediterranean from its present foreboding and dangerous tension. The set objective is gradually but surely to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of security and peace, free from outside interference, with the riparian countries assuming their rightful role as arbiters of their own destiny. It is in the light of these wider ramifications that we consider the two items before us, and that is why we are speaking today.

79. We with to welcome the presence in New York of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Sudan and of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We listened attentively yesterday to the eloquent outpourings of their respective points of view in the statements they made. We greatly regret the bombing incident brought to our attention, which has caused damage and loss of life. We look on the unfortunate incident with dismay. We convey our heartfelt condolences to the families of those who lost their lives and we send our wishes for a speedy recovery to the wounded.

80. We note that even in the midst of differences many positive elements were contained in the statements of the two Ministers. In particular, we noted their call for help to resolve their differences and their expressed willingness to do so. We welcome these sentiments, as we firmly believe that the people of these two friendly non-aligned countries are destined to live and to progress together in open co-operation.

81. We note that the possibilities offered by the regional organizations to which they both belong have not yet been utilized in this case, but that they stand available. In keeping with our position of principle on the role of regional organizations, we would urge and encourage early recourse to these organizations in the first instance.

82. We would also urge restraint and advocate quiet diplomacy, because we firmly believe, from actual experience, that course is the wisest—indeed, the only rational—course. The further deployment of military force only exacerbates tension; it is no way to find a just and durable solution.

83. As you know, Mr. President, we have privately suggested that the Council lend its own authoritative voice to encourage the utilization of the proffered good offices and benevolent good will of friendly countries and regional organizations. We repeat our opinion publicly today. We were gratified yesterday in our individual contacts with both friendly countries to detect a willingness not to seek accusation and condemnation, and not to exacerbate tension. We commend both sides for this accommodating attitude, and we trust that in the next few days positive results will emerge from the high-level contacts which you yourself, Mr. President, in response to the wishes of the Council, have initiated. It is our collective duty to reduce tension and military confrontation. We for our part are ready and willing to make our modest but maximum, and exclusively peaceful, contribution.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61313—January 1993—2,050